THE EXAMINER.

No. 59. SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1809.

THE POLITICAL EXAMINER.

Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few.
SWIFT.

No. 59.

ON THE REVIVED CRY OF JACOBINISM.

(CONCLUDED.)

"Let the illustrious and royal house, that hath been called to the government of these kingdoms, govern them till time shall be no more. But let the spirit, as well as the *letter* of the constitution, they are instrusted to preserve, be, as it ought to be, and as we promise ourselves it will be, the sole rule of their government, and the sole support of their power; and whatever happens in the course of human contingencies, whatever be the fate of particular *persons*, of *houses*, or *families*, LET THE LIBERTIES OF GREAT BRITAIN BE IMMORTAL."—*Bolingbroke's Dissertation on Parties, p.* 7. *Dedication.*

"Thus it happened in those days; and thus it happened in ours; when any man, who declares against a certain person, against whom the voice of the nation hath already declared, or complains of things, which are so notorious, that no man in the nation can deny them, he is sure to be followed by the cry of jacobitism or republicanism. But there is a great difference, God be praised, between the two cases. The present cry, being void of pretence, is therefore without effect. It is heard in few places, and believed only in one."—*Id. p.* 76.

THE Jacobinical alarum was first rung by a RICHARD WHARTON, M. P. for Durham, in a *Letter to the Earl of* LONSDALE *on the Jacobinical Tendency of the Edinburgh Review.* The author tells us, that he should not have condescended to notice the Review, had not it's anonymous and insidious character rendered it's exposure necessary. A very modest apology truly for noticing his betters! Mr. WHARTON, M. P. a genius, who cannot produce a solitary pamphlet of three sheets without violating good English in his sentences as well as sentiments, apologizing for noticing the writings and exposing the imbecility of the *Edinburgh Review!* This dignified self-knowledge is like that of a miserable dwarf, who meeting a giant in the street should accost the passengers thus:—"Here is a fellow, gentlemen, on whom I look down with ineffable contempt, I assure you; but as his presumptuous carriage may induce some of you to have a tolerable idea of his powers, I think it necessary, though with many apologies for the easiness of the matter, just to convince you what a petty, feeble, and fantastic dotard it is, by knocking him down." So saying, the little hero rushes against his antagonist, and dashes out his own modicum of brains against the giant's shin.—As far therefore as the mighty pamphlet regards the Scotish Reviewers, I leave it to their contempt or their *condescension*; but with regard to it's general principles, as the avowed champion of the present system of things, I shall do myself the unspeakable honour of making a few observations.

There appears, at first sight, a touch of irony in the Letter's address, for the Edinburgh Reviewers once coquetted a little with the corruptions of the Constitution, and my Lord LONSDALE is a great proprietor of boroughs; but I do assure the reader that the pamphlet of RICHARD WHARTON, Esq. M. P. is entirely harmless of irony, though he seems to be very angry with the Reviewers for having discontinued the said coquetry. As to corruptions, Mr. WHARTON and his brother courtiers know their logic too well, to allow that such things exist. You might as well expect these men to leave off place-hunting as to hear them acknowledge, that one Minister lavishes places on his family, that another is not a man of sufficient talent, and that persons employed by Government have in many instances no talent at all. However convinced they may be of such things privately, they hush them up as delicately as a robber does his voice, when he comes to plunder us. I would lay my life, that if we were governed by the grossest set of courtiers that ever disgraced the country since the time of Sir ROBERT WALPOLE, or had one of the supidest profligates that ever breathed for our Commander of the Forces, this Mr. WHARTON would never open his lips about the matter.

Mr. WHARTON talks of the "*Papal chair of democracy*," and ranks himself among those who "prefer the *old scriptures* of the Constitution to the legends of Mr. PAIN and his followers." I am glad to see by this holy metaphor, that Mr. WHARTON at least professes a belief in something else besides the *Religio Loci*, the Deity of Place. How the figure of a papal chair, the seat of absolute and undivided authority, can be applied to the dogmata of a multitude of rulers, might be a question of reasonable surprise, if Mr. WHARTON had produced a single consistent metaphor throughout his 46 pages of contradiction. But as he is fond of papal allusions, he should recollect that though the Papists themselves professed to draw their principles from the *old scriptures* too, they were particularly careful not to let the people know *what those scriptures were*; and so little attached are the Reformists, or Jacobins if Mr. WHARTON pleases, to the legends of Mr. PAINE and his followers, that like the Church-Reformers of old, nothing could please them so much as to see the "*old scriptures* of the Constitution" adapted to every body's perusal and exposed, as the Bible was, to the view of every foot-passenger. Talk of old scriptures! The government of

this country for some years past seems to have left us a testament, though not a gospel of peace, that is likely to supersede all the blessed dispensations of our fore-fathers. The Reformists take their political creed neither from Mr. PAINE, nor Mr. PITT, nor Mr. FOX, nor Sir ROBERT WALPOLE, nor Mr. HORNE TOOKE, nor from *any extreme whatever*; they take it entirely from the Rights of the whole English nation as declared at the Revolution of 88; and unless Mr. WHARTON's edition of the *old scriptures* be very much *corrupted*, I am afraid he will be at a loss for texts to support his own doctrines and confute theirs. Mr. WHARTON is an admirer of what is now called legitimate monarchy, that is, he is for all royal families, good or bad, provided they have been royal for some time; he is of course a great advocate of "the beloved FERDINAND," who abdicated his throne from legitimate fear, I suppose, though our courtly M. P. in one part of his pamphlet says that JAMES the 2d. fairly abdicated *his* throne; when I am sure it was from a fear, on his part also, quite as legitimate as that of CHARLES or FERDINAND. He takes care however to tell us, that JAMES though guilty of great violations did *abdicate*. The violations without the abdication would have been no justification, I suppose, of the people's revolt. But there is one passage in this *English* pamphlet, which exhibits at once the inconsistency, the ignorance, and the slavishness of this man's politics, though it is very agreeable to me in one respect, for it will set aside all necessity of further quotation. It is as well to inform the reader, that in the first sentence he alludes to the Edinburgh writing and not to his own.

"In an attempt of this sort, the most striking features are falshood and perversion; *for though we do approve the Spanish Revolution, we have neither felt nor expressed any wish for the radical change of ANY Government, nor for the success of ANY People against their Rulers: and GOD FORBID THAT WE EVER SHOULD!*"

The note of admiration at the end of this precious avowal is his own. As to the poor Jacobins, they must undoubtedly be stricken dumb at a declaration so rational, so manly, and so gloriously British! Had the lovers of Constitutional Reform any desire or necessity to use cant terms against their opponents, they might well answer the appellation of Jacobin by calling this glorious M. P. a Jacobite, for this avowal contains that very doctrine of nonresistance and the divine right of kings, which ruined the STUART family, and as Sir FRANCIS BURDETT said in the House like a true Englishman, has helped to overthrow the oldest thrones in Europe. I know, that Mr. WHARTON can cull from his pamphlet many passages to prove he is a friend to the House of BRUNSWICK; I do not accuse him of ever wanting a contradiction: I only think it singular that a Member of Parliament in these times should pay his court to that royal House by endeavouring *to raise it's* antagonist from the ruins. Our champion of good order and government says he has no wish for the radical change of *any* government, nor for the success of *any* people against their rulers! What, no pity, Mr. WHARTON, for the poor oppressed Turks! No pity for the Algerines, who have seen four of their Deys successively cut down from the throne in the space of four and twenty hours! No pity even for the subjects of Indian Nabobs, whose governments we change so often, though I cannot say radically! To say, that you have no wish for the radical change of *any* government, is either to say that no government can be radically bad, an assertion contradicted by our own history and by every other history, since histories were written; or it is to say, that governments radically bad ought to be tolerated by the people, an assertion ridiculous in the mouth of any man, and scandalous in the mouth of an Englishman, since we should all have been slaves to superstition and tyranny at this very moment, had not our great forefathers bled and died for the radical change of Church and State. Why, HENRY the Eighth, *James the Second*, the Grand Turk himself, or any other "legitimate" tyrant, could have wished no better adoration in the mouth of the most abject of his slaves! Yet JAMES the Second was a *ruler*, and so was king JOHN, though the commonalty and the *nobles* too, the whole people, Mr. WHARTON, did *succeed against* both JAMES and JOHN, in spite of all the place-hunting minions at Court, who had cried out "God forbid they ever should!"

Now let Mr. WHARTON refer to his *old* scriptures, and so will we. He calls the most violent measures of Mr. PITT, and among them of course his suspension of the Habeas Corpus, "*legal* restrictions for the prevention of illegal violence;" he defends the present system of things without reserve; he is an advocate for favouritism, for place-lavishing, for corrupt elections; and finally, he says that no people have a right to rise up against any government, contradicting, in one vile confession of his politics, the glories of his country's ancestors, the finest feelings of human nature, and the principles which the FAMILY OF BRUNSWICK *were brought in to establish*. In short, I defy him, in the name of every honest Reformist whom he has calumniated, to produce from the Declaration of Rights, or from any drafts or documents whatever of the true principles of the British Constitution, the maxims upon which he dares so defend such opinions and such corruptions. He cannot; he knows he cannot; neither can Lord CASTLEREAGH with his nine relations in office, nor the Duke of YORK with his nine mistresses. He may talk of constitutions, and so may a battered rake; but to use an *old scripture* phrase, "there is no health" in either the one or the other.

☞

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

VIENNA, Nov. 14.—On the 11th a courier arrived here, who set out from Constantinople on the 20th of November, and who says, at that period tranquillity was not restored. The fleet had declared for Bairactar, and had fired upon

the Seraglio. It is thought this last revolution will not succeed, because it is thought that the friends of Bairactar, who are spread in great numbers throughout the Empire, will not coolly see their friend sacrificed a victim of this scene of terror. It is not known what has become of the Grand Seignior Mahmud.—There are many contradictory reports respecting the fate of this Prince at Constantinople. It appears certain that Mustapha IV. is no longer in existence, for after the defeat of the Seymens, Bairactar, seeing that the Janissaries were scaling the walls of the Seraglio, caused him to be strangled; he afterwards entered into his palace, where he set fire to a quantity of powder, which he had amassed in case of necessity, to prevent himself from falling into the hands of the Janissaries.

PRUSSIA.

Berlin, Dec. 29.—On the 27th inst. at seven o'clock in the morning, the King and Queen set out, on their visit to the Emperor of Russia, at St. Petersburgh. Prince William (the King's brother), and Prince Augustus, are also gone there. The retinue of their Majesties is not numerous. Since the 16th instant, the persons appointed by the Emperor to meet them, have been waiting at Polangen. Among them is Prince Dolgorucki, who accompanies them to St. Petersburgh. He is also charged with presenting them the valuable furs. A change of Government is about to take place here.

PROVINCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

On the 7th of June, 1780, a whole family was murdered in a cottage at Birtsmorton, Worcestershire; the persons who were so active in destroying the fences of the Malvern Link Inclosure, were suspected of being concerned in the perpetration of the horrid deed: however, the murderers have never been discovered; but circumstances have within these few days occurred at Worcester Infirmary, which seem to have very close connection with the business.—On Thursday se'nnight, a man of the name of James Taynton, of Malvern Link, was brought to that Infirmary with one of his legs dreadfully factured. The day after his admission, he began to be delirious, and continued so with little intermission to the day of his death. During this time he often exclaimed, "I only reared the ladder against the window, and supplied them with drink." These words being heard by another patient, who remembered the murder at Birtsmorton, he asked Taynton if he knew any thing of the murder. He replied, "I helped to throw down the railing (he meant by this, the railing of the Link Inclosure), and to burn it; and I found them drink." He was afterwards asked, whether the murderers were living? He replied, "they were all living, and as old as himself." On the following Saturday, the nurse, in his hearing, was remarking to some of the patients, that it was a pity he would not own to the murder, as she thought he knew something of it; he exclaimed quickly, "Aye, damn you, but you have not got hold of it yet." In consequence of being asked what he took with him to the house, he said *bills*; and from the nature of the wounds inflicted on the bodies, it appears that bill-hooks must have been the instruments used in committing the murders. He fancied continually that demons were coming to seize and torment him; and was, upon the whole, a most affecting instance of the power of conscience upon a guilty mind. Since his death it has been ascertained, that he was one of the labourers employed upon the Link Inclosure, and bore a very bad character;—he died on the Monday.

During the flood, a few days since, a Gentleman being desirous to go from Worcester to Upton-upon-Severn, Owner Bouckley, of Stourport, and two of his men, undertook to convoy him thither in a boat. They arrived there perfectly safe, and landed their passenger; but on their return, the boat, by some means unknown, was upset, and Mr. B. and his men were unfortunately drowned. The bodies have since been all taken up near Severn Stoke.

An inquest was taken on Thursday last at Folkstone, on the body of Thomas Hipwell, of the 12th Light Dragoons, who shot himself on that day. It appeared that the deceased was strongly suspected of having stolen a box, containing upwards of 40l. the property of Sergeant Stewart, who had ordered him into custody for the purpose of sending him to Dover for examination, when the deceased, placing his carbine (which it is conjectured he loaded immediately as suspicion attached to him) to his breast, exclaimed, "I'll do it, so help me God!"—And although several of his comrades were in the stable, he pulled the trigger before they had means to prevent it. The Jury returned a verdict—*Felo de se*; and he was accordingly buried in the highway.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, Feb. 6.

Nothing of general interest occurred this day.—Adjourned.

Tuesday, Feb. 7.

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF.

The Duke of Kent thought it at this time proper to remark, that it had been supposed by many that he had been at variance with his Royal Brother, from which an inference had been drawn that he countenanced the charges brought forward against the Commander in Chief. Whatever professional differences there had been between them, he entertained the highest respect for his Royal Brother, and believed that he was wholly incapable of acting in the manner imputed to him. Instead therefore of countenancing such charges, he would do every thing in his power to repel them. On this subject, there was no difference of opinion in his family, all the members of which concurred in the opinion he had expressed.

STATE OF THE NATION.

Lord Grosvenor brought forward his promised motion for an inquiry into the State of the Nation. He confessed he saw no prospect of peace while Bonaparte continued to be actuated by his present ambitious spirit: but the whole conduct of Ministers should be inquired into, in order that a better system should be adopted than had recently been pursued. His Lordship then recapitulated the occurrences of the war,—the Swedish Expedition,—the escape of the Russian Fleet in the Baltic,—the fatal Convention of Cintra,—the campaign in Spain,—a campaign in which many had perished in the unequal contests, and many more had fallen victims to fatigue and hunger; in which they had lost two of the ablest officers, one slain in the field, and the other (Gen. Anstruther) actually died raving mad, from hunger, fatigue, and vexation of mind! And when at last the remains of our army had reached Corunna, they were kept there four days for want of proper transports; the consequence of which was, the sanguinary and useless battle which took place there. Upon all these grounds, he conceived that the House should resolve itself into a Committee to inquire into the State of the Nation.

The Duke of Montrose said, there could be no ground whatever for the proposed inquiry. If the campaign had been unsuccessful, no fault rested either with the Ministry or the Generals; they had all done their duty.

Lord Grenville was astonished that there could be any opposition to the motion, as the Ministers had so often expressed their anxiety for due inquiry. The public had been told that the campaign in Spain was not conducted on the plan of Ministers, but on the discretion of the Commanders. This most imperiously called for investigation. It was due to the memory of one who died in his country's cause; for the gratitude of the country loudly demanded that the reputation of her dead heroes should not be sullied.

The Lord Chancellor was at a loss to see how the motion could be entertained, as it was of so general and undefined a

nature. As to what had dropped respecting the liberty of the press, he was of opinion that the existing laws were fully adequate to the prevention of any abuse of that liberty, if duly enforced.

Lord ERSKINE perfectly agreed with his noble and learned friend in his sentiments respecting the liberty of the press, the greatest blessing of our free constitution. But in respect to the conduct of Ministers as it related to Sweden, to Portugal, and to Spain, he thought that an inquiry should immediately take place.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL contended that motions so loose and vague were unparliamentary. When the Noble Baron (Lord Grenville) was in power, and the retreat from Dunkirk and the loss of Holland took place, motions similar to the present were resisted by him.

Lord MOIRA belonged, he said, to no party, but he could not but seriously condemn the whole conduct of Ministers. They had sent an army into Portugal when it was wanted in Spain; and when they gave the Spaniards assistance, it was sent, at a time when no possible good could result from it, to the most bigotted, jealous, and ignorant part of the Peninsula. Thus did they expose our gallant troops to unavailing sufferings and fatigues; and he must therefore adjure their Lordships to stop the Ministers in their wild and fatal career.

Lord HARROWBY said, that such language only tended to dismay the country. If Ministers were so incapable and rash, why not move at once for their dismissal?

Lord Grosvenor's motion was negatived without a division.—Adjourned.

Thursday, Feb. 9.

Lord MOIRA called the attention of the House to the evils resulting from the present mode of process in actions for debt; and briefly repeated the substance of the observations he had so frequently submitted to their Lordships on this subject. He did not wish to put an end to arrests in *mesne process*, but he thought the old practice should be revived, of making the plaintiff give a real pledge to prosecute his suit to a final judgment, with the least possible delay. This would prevent the grievance of persons lying in custody, sometimes more than a year, before the actual ground of debt was ascertained. It was also his wish to make a distinction between the case of the fraudulent and the unfortunate debtor. This assertion which he had made of the benefits that would flow from a recurrence to the ancient law and practice, had been controverted by high authorities. He therefore conceived, that the best way of arriving at a proper conclusion, would be to refer the matter to an open Committee.—Lord Moira accordingly moved that a Committee be appointed to inquire into the present practice of imprisonment for debt and the consequences of it.—The motion was agreed to, and the Committee ordered to sit on Monday.—Adjourned.

Friday, Feb. 10.

The House was occupied in the forwarding some routine business, and then adjourned to Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, Feb. 6.

Mr. WHITBREAD brought forward his motion respecting Sir A. Wellesley's being permitted to retain his situation as Chief Secretary for Ireland while attending his military duties in Zealand and Portugal. The Hon. Member, with his accustomed strong sense, condemned this proceeding as highly improper. The office of Chief Secretary for Ireland required the most constant attention, and it was therefore absurd to contend that it could be held by an absent person. However brilliant the talents of the gallant General, he could not possibly be fighting in Portugal and attending in Ireland at the same period; and he who could not perform the duties, ought not to receive the emoluments of a situation. Mr. Whitbread therefore moved that as the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland was an efficient one, of the highest responsibility, that it ought not to be held by any one who was unable to perform its duties.

Sir A. WELLESLEY said, that when he went abroad, it was understood that his office might be filled by another; but the Lord Lieutenant had been pleased to say that he wished his continuance in the situation, provided his stay was not a long one. The business of Ireland had not been delayed in any department during his temporary absence.

Mr. PERCIVAL said that no inconvenience had resulted to the public service by the absence of the gallant General: had it been for a length of time, another person would have been appointed. He therefore should move the previous question.

Lord H. PETTY contended that if no inconvenience resulted from the absence of the Chief Secretary, the place was a useless one, and ought to be abolished: but such an assertion was quite absurd. It was impossible to approve of any one man's holding two such dissimilar employments.

Lord CASTLEREAGH had advised that no successor should be appointed to fill the gallant General's situation. If there was any blame, it should fall upon Ministers: but the military skill of Sir Arthur rendered him peculiarly eligible at this moment for such an office in Ireland. The previous question was then carried.—Adjourned.

Tuesday, Feb. 7.

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF.

The charges against the Duke of York were proceeded in by a Committee of the whole House.

The first witness called was a Mr. *Few*, an auctioneer:—He knew Mrs. Clarke when she lived in Tavistock-place, where he supplied her with some goods, for which not being paid, he brought an action, but was nonsuited by her pleading her coverture. He then threatened to expose her in a handbill, which he sent to the Duke of York: and then he got his money.

Mr. Stowers was next examined. He knew Mrs. Clarke after her marriage with Mr. Clarke, who was a stone mason. He believed Mrs. Clarke had three children by her husband.

Mr. *Comrie*, a solicitor, had been employed by Mr. Clarke. By her desire, he went to the Duke of York, in Portman-square, who wished him to procure 10,000l. by way of mortgage. The Duke desired him to call on Mr. Adam, who was his man of business, which he accordingly did. The witness understood that his Royal Highness had determined to separate from Mrs. Clarke, on account of his being subpœned to attend the trial of an action for goods sold to her, in which she pleaded her coverture; but he did not know that Mrs. Clarke made this plea with the knowledge or under the direction of his Royal Highness.

Mr. *Pearce*, the butler of Mrs. Clarke, when living in Gloucester-place (now in the service of the Hon. Mr. Turner), knew that Ludovic Armor attended the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's, in 1805, and that Armor received a Note from Mrs. Clarke's housekeeper to get changed, which he accordingly did. His Royal Highness was in the house at the time, which was in the summer, just as Mrs. Clarke was going out of town. The witness was only 15 months in Mrs. Clarke's service. The witness was positive as to Amor's getting the note changed.

Capt. *Huxley Sanden* was next examined. He had been concerned with Col. French in a levy of men, and knew Mrs. Clarke, to whom he had been introduced by Mr. Cockayne, an attorney, and Mr. Corri, a musical composer, who was her agent. Capt. Sandon went with Col. French to Mrs. Clarke, in Gloucester-place. The Colonel told him that it was through Mrs. Clarke they had obtained the letters of service, for which he had given her 500l. and on Col. French's departure for Ireland, he desired the witness to let Mrs. Clarke have 5 or 600l. more. It was understood, that if the levy succeeded, Mrs. Clarke was to receive 2000l. but the levy failed, and Mrs. Clarke was the only gainer. During this negociation the witness had seen Mrs. Clarke 50 times. Being asked why the 500l. was given to Mrs. Clarke,—he replied, that though the letters of service had not been refused by the Commander in Chief, yet, being told that Mrs. Clarke could expedite the business, the money was advanced; but he did not think she had facilitated the transaction, as it was full ten weeks after

that the matter was concluded. The witness had no reason to believe that the Duke of York was privy to Mrs. Clarke's receipt of the money. Mrs. Clarke wished the transaction concealed from the Duke. Though the witness thought that Mrs. Clarke had little influence with the Commander in Chief, yet Col. French was of a different opinion, which was the reason the money was advanced to her.

Mr. *Corri* was next called. He stated that Mr. Cockayne introduced Capt. Sandon to him. The witness told the Captain he knew a lady who could serve him, and accordingly he spoke to Mrs. Clarke about it, who said that it was a difficult business, but she would try what she could do. Capt. Sandon went to Mrs. Clarke and settled the business, he believed. Some time after, Mrs. Clarke told the witness that there was a terrible noise, and he must burn all his papers, which he accordingly did. Mrs. Clarke added, that the Duke was very angry; that his Royal Highness was watched by Col. Gordon, and that she was as closely watched by Mr. Greenwood; so that between the two she could get nothing. The witness supped one night at Mrs. Clarke's, when two gentlemen were present. One of them (he understood from Mrs. Clarke) was Mr. Mellish, the Member, and the other, a writer for some newspaper,—the *Times*, the *Morning Post*, or the *Chronicle*, or some paper.

[Here Mr. Mellish rose, and said he had never laid his eyes on Mrs. Clarke till she appeared at the bar of the House.]

Mr. Corri, on being asked whether the other person was Mr. Finnerty, replied, that he did not know Mr. Finnerty. The name mentioned on the evening alluded to, sounded like a foreign name, but he could not remember it.

Mr. *Dowler* was next examined. He had known Mrs. Clarke these nine years. He spoke to Col. French and Capt. Sandon on the subject of the levy by Mrs. Clarke's desire. Mrs. Clarke told him that she was to have 1000l. and one guinea per man on 500 men. Mr. Dowler endeavoured to persuade Mrs. Clarke from meddling in this business, but she said that the Duke of York could not give her any money, and she must get some, for it was the only mode she had of supporting her establishment. Mrs. Clarke was offended with the witness for this advice. The witness had obtained his situation in the Commissariot Department through Mrs. Clarke, for which he had given her 10.0l. and since that various other sums. The witness's father was a wine merchant of property. A Captain Sutton first introduced the witness to Mrs Clarke, who told him that she was extremely pushed for money, as the Duke was not punctual, and proposed to get him a situation. To this proposal, his father at last consented, provided the matter was kept a secret. The witness made no application elsewhere, and in two or three months he was gazetted, in 1805. The presentation was through the Treasury, but he did not recollect the date of his commission. The notification of his appointment was communicated to him by Mrs. Clarke a few days before it took place, when he paid her the 1000l. The witness had no communication with any person whatever on the subject; but he gave the money to Mrs. Clarke for having obtained for him, through the Duke of York, the situation in question. Mrs. Clarke gave him reason to suppose that the Duke was well acquainted with the transaction. The other sums witness had lent to Mrs. Clarke, as she represented herself as being much distressed on various occasions. The witness did not willingly mention these things about the Duke of York and Mrs. Clarke, nor would he say any thing but what he was sure of. He had remonstrated to Mrs. Clarke for two reasons:—the impropriety of the act, and the risk of disclosure: after this remonstrance, he did not see Mrs. Clarke so frequently as before, as she was offended with him. The pay of the situation procured for him by Mrs. Clarke was 15s. a-day; he was Assistant Commissary of Stores. Being asked whether his father might not through his friends have obtained the situation for him?—he said that he did not believe that his father had ever made any application for him. He received his appointment from the Treasury, and the usual questions were put to him on the occasion. In 1801 he had been in business as a Stockbroker, but had left it by the desire of his father. By the failure of others, he had lost considerably, but had paid all his differences. He had never lent Mrs. Clarke money before he quitted the Stock Exchange, and he had not made any memorandums of the several sums he had lent her since. He arrived in town on Thursday last, and had seen Mrs. Clarke, when he begged that he might not be called up on this business. Mrs. Clarke said that she had been driven to this course because the Duke of York had not paid her the annuity, or at least that this was the cause of the business having been brought forward. The witness had always avoided speaking on the subject of his appointment, nor did he believe that Sir B. Watson, or any person at the Treasury, had procured it for him.

Mr. HUSKISSON stated that the course of proceeding in these appointments was by application to the First Lord of the Treasury, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretaries of the Treasury or their private Secretaries.

Mr. STOURGES BOURNE said that no application had been made to him; and Mr. HUSKISSON observed that he would make inquiry into the matter.

Lord FOLKSTONE and Mr. WARDLE wished the House to adjourn.

Mr. PERCIVAL however contended, that it was absolutely necessary Mrs. *Clarke* should be immediately examined.

The Lady was then brought in, when she stated, she was so much exhausted as to be totally incompetent to undergo an examination that night, having been waiting upwards of eight hours; and on being told by the Chairman that there was a chair for her accommodation, she replied, that would not relieve the lassitude of her mind.

Mr. YORKE stated, that if the witness was suffered to depart, without being examined, there was danger of undue influence being exerted, in regard to the evidence she might give on a future day; and, therefore, he hoped, if any precedent existed, she might be kept in custody of the Sergeant at Arms.

The SPEAKER said, he knew of no precedent for such a proceeding since the reign of Queen Anne.

Mr. SHERIDAN thought it would be an unjustifiable infringement upon the liberty of the subject, as she was merely a witness, not on her oath, and charged with no crime.

Mr. CHOKER insisted on the necessity of an immediate examination.

Mr. ADAM thought the House ought not to examine a witness whose state of mind might be hereafter set up as a plea for any inconsistency in her evidence.

Mr. WHITBREAD conceived that the House would best consult its dignity, by allowing the Hon. Member to pursue the course of proceeding which he had a right to act upon. But even though it was unwilling to accede to such a principle, he begged leave to ask the House, whether a female, in attendance for eight hours, and of course suffering much suspense, had not some claim upon the generous feelings of the House, without any reference to the immediate person to whom that feeling was extended. To speak under such circumstances of committing Mrs. Clarke, he trusted would not meet the support of many in that House.—*(Hear! hear! from both sides.)*

Mr. CANNING persisted in the importance of his questions: and said they might be now asked of Mr. Dowler.

Mr. Dowler was then called in and asked:—Q. Since you have been from this bar, have you had any conversation with Mrs. Clarke? A. Only to offer her some refreshment. Q. Did you give her any information as to what had passed between you and this Committee? A. She only asked me the names of the Gentlemen who had examined me; and I said, I did not know them. Q. Were you apprised, that you ought not to have any conversation with her on the subject. A. I felt so. Q. Was it only your own feeling? A. Yes.

Ordered, that the House should resolve itself into the same Committee on Thursday.—Adjourned to Thursday.

Thursday, Feb. 9.

Mr. YORKE complained that his sentiments had been misrepresented. On a former night he had advised that Mrs. Clarke should be lodged in custody, for the purposes of justice

and truth. It had been asserted that this recommendation was novel and harsh; but there had been precedents for such a measure. Mr. Yorke then moved that an extract be read from the Journals of the House, which was done by the Clerk. From this it appeared, that Mr. Walpole had moved on a particular occasion, that no Member should be suffered to go out of the House; that the doors be fastened, the lobby cleared, and that Matthew Prior, Esq. be examined in the most solemn manner, touching matters of great importance, and that during the intervals of examination, he be confined in close custody: and he was kept in confinement from June till February.—Mr. Yorke therefore trusted that what he had recommended would not be deemed either novel or unparliamentary.

Mr. SHERIDAN presented a Petition from Peter Finnerty, of Clement's Inn, Gent. in which the Petitioner stated that he had heard with much concern that his name had been introduced into the discussion in that House, and that several questions had been put to witnesses, which might make an impression on the public mind, highly unfavourable to him on the Trial, which he every day expected to take place, in consequence of a prosecution instituted against him by the Attorney General. In order to remove these impressions, and to satify the House as to his conduct, he begged to state that he was ready to appear at their Bar, to answer any questions the House might think proper to put to him.—Mr. Sheridan, in presenting this Petition, which was ordered to lie on the table, said, that as the Petittoner was under a prosecution it was natural for him to shew that he had never been an agent or adviser of Mrs. Clarke, and that he was not the person stated to have been at supper with Mrs. Clarke and others, at her house.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee, Mr. WHARTON in the Chair.

Mr. S. BOURNE said, he had stated on a former night that he had never seen Mr. Dowler; he had since searched for and could not find any memorandum of that person having been recommended to him.

Mr. HUSKISSON said, he caused the books of the Treasury, and the Commissariat Department, to be examined, and no trace could be found there of Mr. Dowler having been recommended to the Treasury or Commissariat. Inquiries were also made in various other departments, and no trace of any recommendation could be found. But whatever was the channel through which he had been recommended, he was confident the Treasury had no reason to suspect any improper conduct in the recommendation.

Mrs. *Clarke* was then called in. A considerable time elapsed before she appeared, and then she was in tears. A chair was ordered to be brought her. She was examined by Mr Wardle. She said she had been much insulted as she came in through the lobby. Being asked if she knew Colonel French, she said she did. He applied to her to use her influence with the Commander in Chief, to have a levy for the army. Col. French offered her pecuniary advantage for her influence. She could not recollect what sum, or what the conditions were; but she was to receive a pecuniary reward. In consequence of this, she did apply to the Commander in Chief to allow him the levy, and stated to his Royal Highness, that she was to have pecuniary advantages. He promised that Col. French should have the levy. She received in consequence, on this account, the sum of 500 guineas in bank-notes. She gave 500l. of it for a service of plate; his Royal Highness having made up the remainder of the sum for the purchasing the plate. During the progress of the levy, she recollected a loan was to be made to the Commander in Chief of 5000l. Col. French told her he would accommodate his Royal Highness with that loan, if his accounts were passed. She spoke to the Commander in Chief on this subject, but the Duke stated that it was a delicate business, as the thing might be known.

Mr. CROKER asked the witness how often she had seen Mr. Dowler since his arrival in England? She answered, only twice. Q. Did you inform Col. Wardle of the details of the transaction relative to Col. French's levy? Yes, I did of some part; of the best part; but not all. I have had no communication with any body on this business since I left the House the other night. I have only seen two men since. Gen. Clavering called on me to desire his name might not be mentioned, but I would not see him; and another gentleman called whose name I will mention hereafter, as well as what he came about. Q. Have you not at various times received sums of money from Mr. Dowler? A. At some particular times. I had 1000l. from him for his situation. This was not the last sum I received from him, nor can I say if it was the first. Q. Do you owe any money to Mr. Dowler? A. I never recollect any debts *to gentlemen.*—*(A loud burst of laughter.)* I do not recollect or recognise any debts to him.

She then said, she only recollected recognising one debt to Dowler: she sent to him one day, while an execution was pending against her, told him she wanted to go to Weybridge, and desired him to buy a carriage for her, which she very much wanted, and sent word that his Royal Highness would pay him for it. His Royal Highness, when she told him the circumstance, said he would pay him in *some way.* She related to Mr. Dowler this answer from his Royal Highness.

Q. Do you recollect seeing Mr. Corri at your house in January last? A. I saw him twice; it was not long since. I sent him a note to procure me a box at the Opera. When he came I asked him to dine. Q. What other persons were at your house at the time? There was a gentleman, a young relation of mine, and some young ladies. One or two came in, in the course of the evening. She could not say who those others were; but if asked their names she could answer. She believed there was only one gentleman. Being asked who he was, she said a friend.

The CHAIRMAN—"You must answer the question directly." Mrs. Clarke.—"It was Col. Wardle."

She recollected Mr. Corri coming again to her house. Being desired to name all the persons who met Mr. Corri at her house that second time; she asked if she was obliged to answer that question. The Chairman said, if any improper questions were put, the Committee would take notice of them.

Mrs. *Clarke*—"Is that to be after I have answered them?—The Chairman told her she must answer the question put to her.

Mrs. *Clarke*—"What, without appealing to you Sir?—*(a loud cry of hear! hear!)*

Mr. WHITBREAD moved, that the witness should withdraw. He then said, that an instruction ought to be given to the Chairman, to tell the witness she might appeal to the Chair on any question put to her. Whoever, or of whatever description that woman was, she was entitled to the protection of that House.—*Hear! hear!*

Mr. WARDLE recommended to the Hon. Member to spare the feelings of the witness; otherwise, if he pressed his question, he would gain nothing, but greatly wound her feelings. This he would explain to the Hon. Member if he would retire with him for a few moments.

Mr. FULLER.—"I agree fully in what the Hon. Gentleman says, for a number of married men might have been with Mrs. Clarke, and in that case I will protect the witness against her being obliged to tell their names!"

Mr. PERCIVAL recommended that the Chairman should tell the witness she must answer this question; but that she might appeal to the Chair on other questions. As to her present conduct, he could not characterise it in any other way than that of a woman extremely indecent.

Mr. WINDHAM thought the suggession of Mr. Fuller was a very prudent one, and was sorry to find it was not attended to by the House.

The witness was then called; and told by the Chairman, that if a question was put to her, which she objected to, she had a right to appeal to the Chair. But as to this question, she must answer it.

Mr. CROKER then put the question—Who were the men that were at her house the last evening Mr. Corri was there? She answered, Col. Wardle, Capt. Thompson, and the Newspaper-man, whose name she did not recollect, but it began with Mac. Q. Was his name Mac Allum? A. It was. She told Mr. Corri one of the gentlemen was a member. Mr. War-

dle was the person she represented as such. A sum of 200l. was paid her by Mr. Dowler a few days before he got his appointment.

Q. *(By Mr. Percival.)*—Have you been acquainted with Mr. Dowler more than ten years? A. I don't recollect. She never received any money from him before the 200l. which was part of the 1000l. Once or twice she received sums, besides the carriage. Mr. Dowler paid for the carriage in two hours after she sent to him. The sums of 200l. and 800l. were before the carriage. Once or twice afterwards he gave money to her housekeeper, on her telling him something distressing, and when his Royal Highness was out of the way. On the night of the last examination she saw Mr. Dowler, who told her some of the Members harassed him very much, by putting questions that had nothing to do with the subject; and that he would give every guinea he was worth, rather than be brought before such a place again.—*(A laugh)*—The witness only asked him who had examined him.

Q. *(By Lord Folkstone.)*—How long have you been acquainted with the Duke of York?—A. In 1803 he took me under his protection. She was acquainted with him before that. From 1804 to 1806 she had an establishment. Before that time she had apartments in a furnished house. When she lived in Gloucester-place she had two carriages, and about six or eight horses. Men servants were from seven to nine in number. The house belonged to the Duke: she paid the establishment. The Duke promised her 1000l. a year, to be paid monthly; but sometimes he did not make his payment good. Q. Was it out of 1000l. a-year you defrayed such an establishment.—A. His Royal Highness would not tell me what he would give me till I was in it. From three to four months his Royal Highness never gave me a guinea, though he was with me every day. His Royal Highness wanted her to receive the money from Greenwood, but she would not consent; although she knew she must have it more regularly. When any thing unpleasant happened, which was always happening, his Royal Highness would go and bring her a little money. Q. Were the sums you received from his Royal Highness sufficient to keep up the establishment?—A. Not sufficient to pay the servants their wages.—After the Duke had been entreated for some time, his Royal Highness told her, *if she was clever*, she need not ask him for any money at all. The annual expence of her establishment she could not state. The witness had a house at Weybridge. It was the Duke's house. She had no separate establishment there. She only was there from Saturday till Monday. She took four men servants with her when she went. The sums she received from the Duke were never sufficient to pay her establishment, if they were, she should not be in distress. She became acquainted with a Sheriff's officer of the name of William Withers, in consequence of her distress. She could not recollect the first time she applied to the Duke for any promotions. The applications to her were very numerous, but not universally attended to by her: for she was sometimes told by the Duke, what persons were improper: and in that case, he told her to say, she could not interfere, without disclosing the matter to him. She told the Duke of every application, and hundreds were rejected by him. If it was a single application, she told it to the Duke, who had a very good memory; but when there were several, she gave to his Royal Highness the list she received from the applicants. The witness received the thousand pounds from Mr. Dowler for his appointment as Assistant Commissary, which she obtained for him through the Duke of York. She shewed all applications of this nature to the Duke in the first instance; he was perfectly aware of the offers of money made to her; but she was never indelicate in her manner of communicating such things to his Royal Highness. When the Bank note was changed, there being some difficulty in getting the change, his Royal Highness told the servant to go to Steven's Hotel, and he would get it done there.

Mr. WARDLE then rose and stated to the Committee, that, just before he came down to the House, Pearce had called upon him, and mentioned that he recollected the taking the note out to get it changed, and when he (Mr. W.) asked him why he had not stated this to the Committee? He replied, that he was subject to very dreadful head-aches, and that at the time of his examination he was suffering under one of them, by which his memory was affected. He had no farther conversation with Pearce, and it would be for the Committee to determine whether it would not be desirable to have this man produced again at he bar.

Mrs. *Clarke* went on to state that she had never circulated a List of Prices, though she had seen such a list in Cobbett's Register. There was a lady in the room where she waited the other night, who was quite in the habit of military intrigue; she was an officer's widow: but—[*Here the voice of the witness failed and she became quite agitated. The Chairman desired her to sit down, which she did, and burst into tears.*] She then desired Col. Macmahon might be asked what were her propositions to the Duke of York. She was sorry to expose him so—"but here (said she) I have just received a letter in which my feelings are greatly interested, begging of me not to go on."

The letter was produced and read by the Clerk. It was signed by Wm. Williams, and entreated Mrs. Clarke to meet him this evening, however late the hour might be, as he wished to speak with her upon a subject, the nature of which she might easily guess. He concluded by stating, that he would remain till a late hour at the Exchequer Coffee-house, in Westminster-hall, and requested an answer from her as soon as possible.

Q. *by the Attorney General.* Ask the witness if this was the letter that interested her so much. Is this the letter bidding her not go on? A. Yes; from what occurred yesterday I had a right to conclude that the object of this letter was to stop my going on. Q. State that occurrence? A. Yesterday a gentleman called upon me, and sent up word by the servant that he requested an interview with me. I agreed to see him. He introduced himself by stating that he had seen me at the play two months since, in company with Lord Lennox and Sir Robert Peat. He then asked me next, if I felt any revenge towards the Duke of York? and asked me next if there was any one in an adjoining back room? I told him upon my honour and word, that there was not, but that I would open the door, which I did, and convinced him there was not. He then asked me if I would consent to take my children and abandon the country? That if I would do so, money would be no object—that my character could not suffer more than it had done by this business: but he added that he had not received an authority from his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

On this Mr. PERCEVAL moved, that the witness do withdraw for a few minutes; and Mrs. Clarke retired. Mr. PERCEVAL then moved, that the Chairman do report progress, and ask leave to sit again; which Mr. WHARTON did. The House was then resumed; and on the motion of Mr. PERCEVAL, William Williams was ordered to be taken into custody by the Serjeant at Arms. This motion was carried *nem. con.*

In a few minutes the Serjeant at arms reported, that he had brought William Williams in custody to the House.—On the motion of Mr. PERCEVAL, he was called in, and acknowledged the letter to be his hand-writing.

Q. What is your profession? A. A Clergyman. Q. Where do you live? The witness declined to answer; but on being told by the Chairman he must answer all fair questions, he replied, at No. 17, Somer's-place, Somer's-town. Q. Did you deliver the letter to the door-keeper? A. Yes. Q. What was your motive for so doing? A. I was extremely anxious to have a conversation with Mrs. Clarke, and that was my only motive. I was several times at Mrs. Clarke's house on Tuesday, and endeavoured to dissuade her from attending the House, but was not able to persuade her to relinquish the business. I told her she had herself alone to blame for the consequences that might ensue. After she had been examined, she explained to me the questions that had been put to her, and the answers she had given. Q. Did you advise Mrs. Clarke to get out of the way with her children? A. No, I did not; neither did he offer her his protection, as he was afraid to do so, on several grounds. He said, he first saw Mrs. Clarke at the Opera, two months since. He entertained upon that occa-

sion a high esteem for her, and used his eloquence to prevent her from using that sarcastic style of language she was so much inclined to. He was not instructed to do this by any individual whatever, and cautioned her against offending his Royal Highness. The witness went on to state that she turned a deaf ear to his suggestions, and declared she would persist in the conduct he so highly censured. The witness was asked if he had any more to say? A. I shall readily give all the information I possess: Mrs. Clarke, notwithstanding all my remonstrances, continued to conduct herself in the same obstinate and pertinacious way. If the House should conceive he was out of order, or that, by delivering the letter, he had committed a breach of privilege, he was amenable to its punishment. He went on to state, that he had applied to Mr. Lowten, the Duke of York's Attorney, on the subject, but from him he got no satisfaction. He had also spoken to several Members of the House, and particularly to Mr. Adam, whom he had this night addressed in the Lobby. He told that Gentleman he had no communication or letter for him from Mr. Clarke, and only wished to assure him of a matter springing from his own mind.—The witness withdrew.

It was then proved by Mr. Jones, the Marshal of the King's Bench, that Williams had been, and was now, deranged, and actually mad.

Col. GORDON said, that Williams had called on him, but he could not make out what he meant.

Mr. LONG said a few words in justification of the Duke of York, and in contradiction to what Mrs. Clarke had stated. She had said, that Mr. Dowler had never been mentioned by her to his Royal Highness, and the Hon. Gentleman said he had never seen Mr. Dowler until he had been examined at the Bar. Mrs. Clarke had also stated, that there had been a list of officers intended for promotion made out, and that such list had been made out so long ago as the time of the late Mr. Pitt. That Mr. Long denied; had there been such a list, he must have known of it and seen it.

Colonel MACMAHON stated, that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, having received an anonymous note, he directed Colonel Macmahon to see into it. He accordingly went to No. 14, Bedford-row, Russell-square, where he was introduced to a Lady, who commenced a conversation of a very extraordinary nature, which it would be improper to detail, even if he remembered it. But the object of it was to establish a difference between two illustrious brothers, which he felt convinced, from his knowledge of the illustrious person, whom it was his pride and honour to love and to serve, must be groundless; although she endeavoured to shew the most confirmed hatred on the one part; to prove the existence of such hatred, she stated that no one was more competent than Mrs. Clarke. "Do you know Mrs. Clarke, said she. Her celebrity is such, said I, as to have made her known to the world; but it appears so much her disposition to gratify vengeance, and her habit to indulge in deceit, that no candid or rational person would attend to her representations. But the singularity of the scene consisted in this, that I was addressing these remarks to Mrs. Clarke herself; so it turned out, for the lady asked whether I was aware that I was speaking to Mrs. Clarke herself, adding, you are, Sir, and I know you; it was Mr. Adam and you who gave me my character. She then dwelt upon the Duke of York's separation from her. She mentioned to me that the Duke of York had promised her £400 a-year, if she would go into the country, and conduct herself with propriety; she said that she accordingly went into the country, into Devonshire; but not receiving any salary, after some lapse of time, she returned to town; she applied in vain for her annuity. The Duke of York was firm, and would hear no more of her. I told her, that if her statements were correct, I had a full persuasion that if she waited on Mr. Adam, she would obtain relief. Herself afterwards took the liberty of mentioning the [illegible] Duke of York, but her conduct was so [illegible] have nothing whatever to do with her [illegible] about her."

Mr. Long [illegible] said that the Duke of York had promised [illegible] him; he begged to say that his Royal Highness had never mentioned that Gentleman's name to him. The Duke recommended a Mr. Manby to him.

Mrs. Clarke was again examined.—She said that the Duke of York was angry with her for being incautious. When Mr. Dowler's application took place, she stated particularly to the Duke, that she had promised to procure him the situation, as he was to give her the money. Applications had been made to her for preferments in the Church. Dr. O'Meara wanted to be made a Bishop, and sent her his documents. There were others also, who thought she would obtain for them a Deanery or a Bishoprick, but she had no influence in such matters. The agent who made their applications was named Donovan. She mentioned Dr. O'Meara to the Duke of York, who told her that the Doctor had preached before the King, but his Majesty did not like the O in his name. Donovan mentioned Dr. Glasse and others, but Mr. Wardle took away the letters on the subject, and Mr. Donovan seems disposed to deny every thing. The Duke of York paid several sums of money for her —he paid 1500l. to a silversmith for her. When the separation took place she was in debt more than 2000l.

Miss Taylor was now examined.—She had known Mrs. Clarke for many years, and visited her in Gloucester-place. On one occasion she heard the Duke of York speak to Mrs. Clarke relative to Col. French's levy. The Duke's words were, as nearly as she could recollect, as follow:—"I am continually wearied by Col. French about his levy. He is always wanting something more to be done in his favour. How does he behave to you, Darling?" Mrs. Clarke replied, "Middling: not very well." The Duke then said, "Master French must mind what he is about, else I will soon cut up himself and his levy too."—The witness lives at Chelsea with her sister, and they kept a school. The witness's brother married Mrs. Clarke's sister. Being asked several questions respecting her father, and where he lived, she begged to decline answering them.

Lord FOLKSTONE thought that the questions asked were irrelevant, and only put by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL for the purpose of making the witness trip in her evidence.—This the Attorney-General denied: he wished to learn the connexions of such a questionable witness.—Mr. BRAND thought that there might be circumstances of real and serious difficulties, where it would be inconsistent with the best feelings of the heart, and a violation of duty, not to deny the residence of a father.—Mr. WILBERFORCE did not like the manner in which the question was put: it appeared like brow-beating the witness.

Miss *Taylor* was again examined.—She did not like to tell where she lived: she was poor, and her testimony would not be believed. Her father's affairs were in an embarrassed state. She now lived at No. 9, China-row.

Mr. *Sutton*, Deputy Judge-Advocate of the Essex District, recollected the Court Martial of Captain Thompson, at Colchester. Mrs. Clarke was examined upon oath, but no interrogatory was put to her as to her being a widow. The Attorney described her as a widow, and it was so entered.

Mr. *Parker*, the executor of Mr. Birkett, was examined as to the payment for a service of plate furnished to Mrs. Clarke. He produced some accounts of monies paid, but knew nothing of the business.

Capt. *Tuck* being asked whether, in 1803 or 1804, an offer was made to him by Mr. Donovan of a Majority at a reduced price. The Attorney-General objected to the question as not relating to the Duke of York. Mr. WARDLE stated, that all he meant to prove was, that he offered commissions at low prices.

Mr. Alderman *Coombe* said that he knew Mr. Dowler, and having heard that he had procured a situation in the Commissariat through the interest of Mrs. Clarke, he asked Mr. Dowler whether it was through that lady or Sir B. Watson that he had got the appointment; when Mr. Dowler replied, "Oh, through Sir B. Watson.—Mr. Alderman Coombe believed Mr. Dowler was a man of strict integrity. Mr. Dowler's father was

a Whig, but he did not know what Sir B. Watson's political principles were.

Mr. *Donovan* knew Mrs. Clarke, but had never furnished her with a list of Officers for whom he wished to procure promotion. The witness was never in the habit of trafficking for places under Government. He had offered to Mr. O'Hara a situation for three thousand pounds, as Writer to the India Company; but the negociation failed.—Mr. Tahourdin was the person who had authorised him to dispose of the situation. The witness had applied to Mrs. Clarke for her influence to procure for a Clergyman the Deanery of Salisbury or Hereford. Mrs. Clarke said, she could procure the situation; she was to have three thousand pounds for it. Some ladies had entered into a subscription for this object, who wished to procure the Deanery for Mr. Bazeley, without his knowledge. Mrs. Clarke afterwards told the witness that the Duke of Portland had no influence in the Church, the Queen having taken all the patronage into her own hands. The witness then proceeded to state his own military services, that he had received a wound, which prevented his taking his clothes off for these five years. He acknowledged that he had applied to facilitate the commissions for three officers, for which he was to receive a remuneration. It was Mr. *Froome*, clerk to Mr. Greenawood, who put the business into his hands, and 300l. beyond the usual prices were to be paid for these commissions. He applied also to Mrs. Clarke for two Majorities: she was to have 500l. on each Majority, and 100l. for the Companies. Being asked by Lord Folkstone whether he thought these things were proper? witness replied, as he knew that such things were passing daily, he did not think the crime was a henious one. Q. He had said, that he never directly, or indirectly, trafficked in places under Government—Did he abide by that answer? A. He had never trafficked in this way further than he had mentioned. —Q. Did the witness not call that trafficking? A. He left the Gentlemen of the House to decide. Q. Were these the only transactions of the kind he ever had in his life? A. Yes. —Q. Was he sure of that? A. Not quite sure. The witness stated that his acquaintance with Mrs. Clarke had commenced in 1805, when he waited on her in order so clear himself from a suspicion of having written some scurrilous paragraphs against the Duke of York. He had seen Mrs. Clarke two or three times while she was connected with the Duke of York. He went to see her the third time, in order to receive some letters to be inserted in the *Morning Post* in answer to Belisarius. She asked him to get these letters inserted, and he did get them inserted. He allowed that he had been concerned in another writership transaction, besides the one he had mentioned. He succeeded the second time, and got 350l. He did not believe he had been concerned in any other writership, but he was not certain. The witness admitted, he had been engaged in endeavouring to procure a place in the Custom-house, through Mrs. Clarke.

Q. Which were the first transactions of the kind he had been engaged in—those that related to the Church, or those that related to the State? A. His first related to a Commissariat appointment and a Landing Waiter. Q. The witness had stated before, that he had never been engaged in trafficking for places under Government, and yet he had stated no less than nine transactions of this kind in which he had been concerned? A. But not with effect.

The witness stated, in answer to Mr. Dundas, Mr. Barham, and others, that the persons with whom he negociated about the writership, were Tahourdin, an Attorney, and Messrs. Austin and Maude.

After the House resumed, Mr. J. Smith proposed that Mr. Tahourdin should be called to the Bar; but this was over-ruled on the suggestion of Mr. Perceval, who said that this affair did not relate to the Duke of York's business.

Mr. Perceval further mentioned, that he had had it long in contemplation to propose a law to prevent this practice of jobbing, making the appointments void, and subjecting those who engaged in such transactions to punishment. But if Mr. Smith chose to make this traffic in writerships the subject of investigation by a Committee, he would have no objection.

Adjourned at four o'clock.

Friday, Feb. 10.

INDIA COMPANY.

Mr. G. Smith moved that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the corrupt practices said to exist in the obtaining civil or military appointments under the East India Company.

Mr. Grant seconded the Motion, as it was the anxious wish of the Directors that the subject should be properly inquired into, and punishment fall on the guilty. The motion was agreed to, and a Committee appointed.

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF.

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of Inquiry,

Mr. Wardle said, it had been asserted that he was connected with Mr. Finnerty; but he again had to observe, that he had derived no information whatever from that gentleman: he wished that Mr. Finnerty should be called to the Bar, as then these insinuations would be proved groundless. His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Sheridan) though he had done him the justice to say that his *intentions* were pure, had yet said, that he (Mr. Wardle) had lent himself to a foul conspiracy. He was sorry to hear this from his Hon. Friend, with whom he had spent many of the happiest hours of his life; but he must say, that he was acquainted with no man whom he would not own in the face of the House and the world. He knew of no conspiracy, as had been talked of: if he did, he would be one of the first to drag the conspirators to justice. He should not be deterred from doing his duty, and he pledged himself to sift to the bottom the transactions now before the House. He begged to say something as to the last female witness examined last night: she was the daughter of a gentleman, and had two brothers in the army; she had told him, if it was necessary to state the truth she would do it, though it might be the ruin of her nearest and dearest friends.

Mr. Perceval said, that the Hon. Gentleman was not in order: he had only to proceed with his evidence; as to the witnesses, there would be ample time to balance their credibility, after the whole evidence was before the House.

Mr. Sheridan said, that he uttered no such word as conspiracy: he had cautioned his Hon. Friend not to associate himself with a foul and impure channel: was it doing his Hon. Friend an unfriendly turn, when he knew he had supped at Mrs. Clarke's with one Macallum, the author of the pamphlet against the Duke of York, to caution him against that person or the notorious Mr. Cockayne?

Mr. Wardle wished that the letters of Mr. Donovan to Mrs. Clarke should be read, as that person had asserted that he had never been engaged in jobbing.

Five letters were then read:—The first requested Mrs. Clarke's interest to procure the vacant Deanery of Hereford for Dr. Glasse, Rector of Hanwell, a friend of Mr. Donovan, who would give 1000l. for it.—The second letter informed Mrs. Clarke that several ladies, among whom was Lady Cardigan, had subscribed 3000l. to procure for the Rev. T. Beasley a vacancy in Salisbury Cathedral: Mr. Beasley, he said, had written against the Catholics, and had the interest of the Dukes of Cambridge and Cumberland.—The third letter stated, that the place of Inspector of Customs being vacant, he wished it obtained for Mr. Tobin, although he heard that the Queen and the Duke of Dorset wished to make an appointment themselves. He also asked Mrs. Clarke whether she could procure the paymastership of the 2d battalion?—The fourth and fifth letters were respecting a tide-waiter's place and the paymastership of the 6th battalion.—All these letters Mr. Wardle had carried away from Mrs. Clarke, without her permission.

Mr. C. Bradshaw said, that from these proofs of Donovan's prevarication, he should move that he be sent to Newgate.

Mr. Percival said there certainly was good ground for such a motion, but it could not with justice be confined to that witness only.

Pearce, the late Butler to Mrs. Clarke, was then examined. He now stated that he himself had changed a bank note for Mrs. Clarke. The Duke of York was present when he took

it. He got change at a confectioner's in Vere-street. The reason why he had not stated this on his former examination was, that he was afflicted with violent head-aches which destroyed his memory. He met the Duke's valet, Ludovic Armor, in the Park, who told the witness that he had been mistaken about him, for he had only changed a 10l. note, and not a larger one. The witness knew that Miss Taylor visited Mrs. Clarke frequently at Gloucester-place.

Gen. Clavering was now examined. He said he had called on Mrs. Clarke to tell her that he did not wish to be called before the House, as what he could say would only tend to Mrs. C.'s injury. Witness stated that Mrs. Clarke had imposed on him, as she told him that she was under the protection of Mr. Mellish when she was not. Witness had seen Miss Taylor at Gloucester Place: he did not know that Mrs. Clarke had any military influence with the Commander in Chief.

The Marquis of TITCHFIELD explained to the Committee, the circumstances that was stated of an application having been made to the Duke of Portland, from the Rev. Mr. Beazely. He read a letter from that gentleman, directed to the Duke of Portland, in which he stated, that he was writing for the benefit of Administration; and begged his Grace to promote him in the Church.—From that time, his Noble Relation directed, that Mr. Beazely should never be suffered to come to his house; and communicated the circumstance to the Bishop of London, in whose diocese this clergyman had two chapels. To this, an answer was immediately sent by the Bishop, signifying his disapprobation of Beazely's conduct, whom he considered as a very weak man.

Mr. *Parker*, of Fleet-street, was next called in, but he had not the papers of Birket along with him.

A person belonging to the house of Martin and Co. bankers, was called in, and asked if he had any checks of the late Mr. Birket: he said he had not, nor did he bring any accounts with him now. He did not know of any body having been at his house on this subject within the last ten days. The witness afterwards produced some checks drawn upon Birket and Parker in favor of Mrs. Clarke. The witness was asked if he knew of any bills in his banking-house, that were accepted by Mrs. Clarke or the Duke of York.

Mr. *Percival* objected to this question, because the regular mode must be to produce the books.

Col. *Lorraine* was the next witness. He held a situation in the Commander in Chief's Office, when Col. French applied for a levy. The application came in writing, and proposed to raise a corps of 5000 men. The witness then produced the correspondence which took place between Col. French and the Secretary to the Commander in Chief. The proposals were accepted. The object of this examination was to show, that the levy was a thing which followed of course, from the application which had been made. After the levy had been approved it was sent to the Secretary of War. There was a letter, dated April 16, 1805, to the Secretary at War, signifying his Majesty's pleasure that the levy be discontinued, and directing that due notice be given thereof to Col. French and Capt. Sandon. These Gentlemen then proposed certain alterations in the levy, to which proposal Col. Gordon wrote an answer, by order of the Duke of York, stating his Royal Highness's refusal to accede to the proposal.

Mr. *Donovan* was called in.—He knew Major Tonyn.—In March 1804, Capt. Sandon called on him, and told him he could get a Majority for any officer. He mentioned the name of Capt. Tonyn, who wanted a Majority: and the terms were to be 500l. In the year 1805 he found that Capt. Tonyn was promoted: he was gazetted in 1804. Next year he was informed by Mrs. Clarke that she was the person who obtained that promotion for Major Tonyn. He understood the money had been lodged in the hands of a Mr. Gilpin. Mrs. Clarke told him she had received the money for his Majority in the 31st Regiment, from Capt. Sandon. Capt. S. told witness he could obtain various promotions. A Major Shaw had applied for a Lieut.-Colonelcy; but could not get it through this channel. A Lady, a Mrs. Havenden, told him she had a power to obtain promotions. This Lady lives at No. 29, Villiers-street, York-buildings. She introduced Major Shaw to Mrs Clarke. The witness received 25l. for the introduction of Major Tonyn to Capt. Sandon. It was in May 1805 that witness heard from Mrs. Clarke. She had received a sum for Major Tonyn's promotion. The cause of his waiting on Mrs. Clarke was, a report that he was the author of a paragraph against the Duke of York, which he traced to Mrs. C. and through her, to a Capt. Sutton. Mrs. Clarke never informed witness of the Duke of York's knowing any thing of her transactions till November last; when she said, among other things, that she was extremely ill-used by his Royal Highness, and if he did not act right towards her, she would publish the whole of his transactions. She never said she had told the Duke of her obtaining money for promotions; but on the contrary, when he visited her in Gloucester-place, she was greatly alarmed when his name was announced; and Major Shaw had his papers back again on that occasion, and his promotion did not take place. In November last, Mrs. Clarke did not inform witness that she had communicated to the Duke the circumstance of her having received money for promotions. In Gloucester Place, she told him, if the Duke knew of her having obtained money in that way, she would be disgraced, and the Officer would lose his promotion. Being asked to what extent Mrs. Clarke told him in November last, that she dealt in commissions; he said he could not answer the question without disclosing the names of *many* persons she had mentioned. She said then, if the Duke did not come into her terms she would soon have him ousted from his command, after which he must retire to Oatlands, where he would soon *cut his throat*. He could not prevail on her to name her associates in bringing forward her charges against the Duke; but she said to witness, she would provide for him if he assisted her; and that she should then have a *carte blanche*, and *deal* more extensively than ever she had done before. She mentioned the names of one or two persons who had offered her money for papers against the Duke. She said that Sir Francis Burdett had offered her 4000l. for the papers she had. The other persons he did not wish to mention. (*A loud cry of name.*)

The CHAIRMAN told the witness he must answer the question. The witness (*wiping a tear from his eye*) said it was Capt. Dodd.—[*Capt. Dodd is in the service of the Duke of Kent.*]

Q. You said you could implicate a great many names; you have mentioned but two. Do you mean to say that *two* constitute a *great many*? A. Two cannot constitute many. I am in an error in mentioning "many."

Capt. *Sandon* was then called in, and stated the history of Major Tonyn's promotion. He told Mrs. Clarke that 500l. was offered to Capt. Tonyn for a Majority. She desired that the bargain might be closed immediately. Mr. Donovan said to him that Capt. Tonyn was tired of the delay that took place, and very angry at his promotion being delayed, and desired his security might be given up, as his father, Gen. Tonyn, had obtained a promise of the Majority from the Duke of York. He told this to Mrs. Clarke, who said that Tonyn was a shabby fellow, and must wait a little longer. Shortly after the promotion was gazetted, and he obtained 500 guineas from Mr. Gilpin, 500l. of which he gave to Mrs. Clarke, and the remaining 25l. he gave to Donovan. He had no reason to know that it was Mrs. Clarke who got Major Tonyn gazetted. He had his doubts on it. He did not believe it had been done through her influence.

Mrs. *Clarke* was then called in.—She acknowledged she had received 500l. from Captain Huxley Sandon, for obtaining the Majority for Capt. Tonyn, in the 31st regiment; but positively denied having ever held such a conversation with Mr. Donovan, as was stated by that witness. She never asked him to become her associate in carrying on a prosecution against the Duke of York; and she positively denied having ever told Donovan, or any body else, that Sir Francis Burdett or Captain Dodd had offered her money for the papers she had in her possession. "I will repeat," said Mrs. Clarke, "what Mr. Donovan said to me the other night in the witness-room. He said, if Col. Wardle had told him of what he intended respect-

ing the Duke of York, and had behaved in a handsome manner, he would have been of great assistance to him; but as it now was, he should be against him."—Mrs. Clarke had seen Sir Francis Burdett accidentally, but he had never applied to her for papers, or spoken to her about the Duke of York. She knew Capt. Dodd, but he had never spoken to her on the subject. She had written anonymous letters to the Prince of Wales, whom she wished to have spoken to, but he declined, as he was going to Brighton; but the Prince sent her a very polite message, and said that Col. Macmahon would interfere for her with the Duke of York. Col. Macmahon sympathised with her in her sufferings, and told her (after having seen the Duke of York) that his Royal Highness laid all the blame on Mr. Adam, and that he would look into her affairs. Mrs. Clarke acknowledged that she had mentioned her ability to procure situations to Mr. Maltby, of Fishmonger's-hall; but said she did not think it proper to mention the names of her friends.

(Here she was called to order, and told to be more respectful to the House.)

Mr. PERCEVAL said that her conduct was most unbecoming, and in any other case would have drawn down the punishment of the House.

Mrs. *Clarke* proceeded in her statement.—Mr. Ludovick had deposited from 10 to 1000*l.* for a situation; but he had met with disappointments from day to day. Mr. Wardle told her that he had watched her into the Duke of Portland's; but she laughed at this, and said that it was more likely to have been *Mrs. Gibbs.* She had not said she could procure appointments through the Duke of Portland or the Lord Chancellor.

At the conclusion of Mrs. Clarke's examination, Col. Gordon was introduced, but nothing material occurred; after which the Committee was adjourned till Monday, and Lord Petty's motion on the Cintra Convention deferred till Tuesday.

Mrs. Shaw, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, Mr. R. Manners, and several other witnesses, were summoned for Monday.—Adjourned till Monday.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTS.

R. Mackenzie, King's Arms-yard, merchant, Feb. 11, 18, March 21, at twelve. Attornies, Messrs. Blunt and Bowman, Old Pay Office, Broad-street.

H. J. Pawel, Uxbridge, builder, Feb. 11, 18, March 21, at twelve, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Mills, Ely-place.

W. Allen, Chandos-street, Covent-garden, Feb. 11, 18, March 21, at ten, at Guildhall. Attornies, Messrs. Pitches and Samson, Swithin's-lane.

W. and J. Glover, Poultry, haberdashers, Feb. 14, at twelve, 21, March 21, at ten. Attorney, Mr. Mason, St. Michael's Church-yard, Cornhill.

T. Lewis, Bedminster, bacon-factor, Feb. 11, 28, March 21, at twelve, at Guildhall. Attornies, Messrs. Frowd and Blandford, Temple.

J. H. Merry, West Smithfield, oilman, Feb. 11, 18, March 21, at eleven. Attorney, Mr. Russen, Crown-court, Aldersgate-street.

D. Hetherington, Lowcrosby, Cumberland, drover, Feb. 20, 21, March 21, at eleven, at the Green Dragon, Carlisle. Attorney, Mr. Blow, Carlisle.

J. and J. Eastwood, Uppermill, Yorkshire, dyers, Feb. 22, 23, at the New Inn, Saddleworth, March 21, at the Rose and Crown, Huddersfield. Attorney, Mr. Ingham, Dobeross.

J. James, Bristol, cooper, Feb. 19, 23, March 21, at eleven. Attorney, Mr. Stephens, Bristol.

W. Simpson, Sheffield, innkeeper, Feb. 16, 17, March 21, at one, at the Tontine Inn, Sheffield. Attornies, Messrs. Parker and Brown, Sheffield.

DIVIDENDS.

Feb. 18. J. Weston, Pall-mall, vintner.—May 2. W. Tucker, jun. Exeter, serge-manufacturer.—March 7. F. Linley, Holborn, music-seller.—Feb. 28. J. Crossley, Halifax, merchant.—Feb. 28. J. Morgan, Enfield Highway, farmer.—March 4. W. Davies, Holborn, linen-draper.—March 11. M. Joel, High-street, Shoreditch, dealer in glass.—Feb. 14. Margarett Longmire, Penrith, milliner.—Feb. 28. W. Handley, Beverley, currier.—Feb. 28. W. Sarman and E. Ford, Cheltenham, linen-drapers.—Feb. 28. R. Battison and S. Wade, Manchester, merchants.—March 4. G. Witham, Addingham, Yorkshire, drover.—Feb. 28. G. Godwin, Stafford, cordwainer.—Feb. 27. T. Ainsworth, Blackburn, and J. J. and J. Watson, Preston, cotton manufacturers.—March 1. A. Clarke, Liverpool, merchant.—March 3. J. Smalley, W. Ellison, and R. Walmsley, Blackburn, cotton-manufacturers.

CERTIFICATES—FEB. 23.

S. Danford, Abchurch-lane, broker.—J. Appleton, Castleton, Lancashire, woollen-manufacturer—G. Mallison, Gauxholme, Lancashire, corn-miller.—R. Jackson, Oxford-street, rectifier.—J. B. Skelton, Bell-lane, Spitalfields, merchant.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

This Gazette contains an account of the capture of L'Iris, French national frigate, of 24 guns and 140 men, by the Amiable, Capt. Stuart, after a running fight, in which the English had two men wounded, and the French two killed and eight wounded. L'Iris was bound for Martinique, with 646 casks of flour on board.

BANKRUPTS.

T. Frow, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, innholder, to surrender March 9, 10, 25, at eleven, at the Saracen's Head, Lincoln. Attorney, Mr. Baldwin, Lincoln.

W. Fairbridge, Gough-square, Fleet-street, dealer, Feb. 16, March 1, 25, at eleven, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Brace, New Boswell-court, Carey-street.

H. Catlell, Duke-street, Worship-square, silk-manufacturer, Feb. 18, 25, at twelve, March 25, at one, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Coote, Austin-friars.

T and G. Wood, Kirkby-Malzeard, Yorkshire, butchers, Feb. 27, 28, at the Queen's Head, Kirkby-Malzeard, March 25, at the Black Swan, Bedale, at eleven. Attorney, Mr. Coates, Ripon, Yorkshire.

J. Salter, Bermondsey New-road, carpenter, Feb. 21, 28, March 25, at one, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Meymott, Burrows-buildings, Blackfriars-road.

J. C. Philipps, Bankhouse, Yorkshire, cotton-spinner, Feb. 24, 25, March 25, at eleven, at the Devonshire Arms, Keighley. Attorney, Mr. Hardacre, Colne, Lancashire.

T. Boardman, jun. Manchester, liquor-merchant, March 3, 4, at the Dog Tavern, Manchester, 25, at Lancaster Castle, at two. Attornies, Messrs. Foulkes and Creswel, Manchester.

Sarah Evans, Wolverhampton, carpenter, March 6, at four, 7, at ten, 25, at eleven, at the Jerningham Arms, Shiffnall. Attorney, Mr. Biddle, Wolverhampton.

T. Scott, Thanington, Kent, victualler, Feb. 23, at seven, 24, March 25, at eleven, at Guildhall, Canterbury. Attorney, Mr. Elwyn, Canterbury.

J. Connop and C. L. Newton, Red Lion-street, Spitalfields, dyers, Feb. 18, at eleven, 28, March 25, at ten, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Alliston, Freeman's-court, Cornhill.

W. Eustace, Little Carter-lane, Doctor's Commons, cabinet-maker, Feb. 21, 28, March 25, at one, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Sweet, King's Bench Walks, Temple.

W. Brown, Wormwood-street, London Wall, victualler, Feb. 15, 24, March 25, at ten, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Taylor, Craven-street, Strand.

J. H. Clarke, St. James's-street, Westminster, milliner, Feb. 18, 21, March 25, at eleven, at Guildhall. Attorney, Mr. Chambers, Furnival's Inn.

DIVIDENDS.

March 25. James Sommervail, Liverpool, merchant.—March 11. J. and S. Newell, Stoke, Staffordshire, carriers.—March

7 S. Scott, Cannon-street, factor.—March 6. T. Simpson, Wm. Taylerson, J. Sanderson, and J. Granger, Stokesley, Yorkshire, bankers.—March 6. Wm. Atkins, Stone, Staffordshire, maltster.—April 3. J. Gill, Brownshill, Gloucestershire, clothier.—March 6. H. Williams, Chepstow, merchant.—March 11. M. Clemence, Craven-street, Strand, taylor.—March 25. R. Farbridge, Paragon-place, Kent-road, Surrey, timber-merchant.—March 4. J. Collip, Great Portland-street, Mary-le-bone, upholsterer.—March 7. R. Soanes, Mark-lane, provision-merchant.—April 8. Charles Wright, Aldgate, tobacconist.

CERTIFICATES—March 4.

M. Brooks, Shepperton, Middlesex, corn-dealer.—T. Squire, sen. and T. Squire, jun. Stoke Damarell, Devonshire, tin-plate-workers.—J. Tennant, Manchester, butcher.—M. F. Brooks, Horsleydown, mariner.—W. H. Pullen, Dartmouth, Devonshire, spirit-dealer.—J. Capper and J. Bathgate, Chetham, Lancashire, victuallers.—F. Gardner, Butt-lane, Deptford, mariner.—Ives Hurry, Nag's-head-court, Gracechurch-street, merchant.

PRICE OF STOCKS ON SATURDAY.

Consols.....67 ½ ⅛ 1-4 | Red. Ann.....63⅛ 68

THE EXAMINER.

London, February 12.

The proceedings in the House of Commons supersede at present every other political interest, and it is well for the curious or the anxious politician that they do, for the sound of continental news fades every day more and more from our ears, as our continental influence is dying. The Ministers, it is said, have given up for the present the idea of sending 60,000 men into the South of Spain; and why? Because, it seems, they must wait till they hear what the Spanish Ambassador, Don Pedro Cevallos, says! What! Have they no Ambassador of their own to the Supreme Junta? Can they get no information from Spain whatever, without Don Pedro? Are the Spaniards really so enthusiastic, that they cannot speak for joy, when they see an Englishman? I will tell them what Don Pedro will say, when he arrives in Westminster: he will say "God grant your Excellencies many years: my countrymen can do nothing on the Continent, but as many of them as possible will pay you their respects here, and I for my part cannot express the exquisite satisfaction I experience in beholding the country of Great Britain, the magnanimous Great Britain, the *generous* Great Britain, the protector of the 'noble race of established potentates,' the last asylum of Liberty and Patriotism." And I have no doubt his satisfaction will be sincere. Never was there a bird of passage who understood seasons and climates better than Don Pedro. But what is Bonaparte doing all this time? If we are waiting till Don Pedro comes, do we think he is waiting till Don Pedro goes?

Oporto, they say in the last arrivals yesterday, is not *yet* in the hands of the French; and the Lisbonites are represented as full of enthusiasm, and preparing for a vigorous defence. This is a matter of course. Every body, whether in Madrid or in Lisbon, is always full of enthusiasm, and does nothing but *prepare* for a vigorous defence—till the French come. A vigorous defence! What do these wretches possess that is worth defending? Have they a liberal government, a free press, or *any* possession of the least moral or political value?

The Trial of the Duke of York is said to be drawing to a close, and I trust that the reader has attended strictly, throughout it, to the *characters* of the persons concerned, both as they were *before* the trial, as they *now* are during the trial, and as they will undoubtedly be after it. I shall comment upon the business at length next week; and for the present will recommend to very serious perusal the following extract that was published yesterday in the *Courier* newspaper; yes, even in the *Courier* newspaper, from the *Sheffield Iris*, of the 6th February:—

"The subjects of Mr. Wardell's motion respecting the Duke of York, as Commander in Chief, continue to be investigated in the House of Commons. We have given as much of the examinations as our limits would allow, to the exclusion of Parliamentary matter intrinsically more important. But public curiosity must be gratified, even when shame, confusion of face, and dismay of heart must overwhelm every man who can feel for the honour, the virtue, the laws, or the religion of his country. We care not what may be the decision of the House of Commons on the particular charges against the Commander in Chief; he will be acquitted no doubt; for on such evidence no man ought to be condemned; but by the unblushing avowal of his own advocates, advisers and friends, his Royal Highness as a Man, a Prince, and a Christian,—a *married* man, an *episcopal* Prince, an *exemplary* Christian, is sunk into a situation, which, with all the splendour, servility and voluptuousness that surround him, the poorest wretch that has applied for Charity at the Cutler's Hall, has no occasion to envy. If there be a conspiracy in this nation to degrade Royalty, we need only look to Mrs. Clarke's *quondam* establishment in Gloucester-place, to know of what rank the conspirators are, and that being ascertained, we confess that we do tremble for the King and Country."

Among the various military appointments and promotions that have appeared in the Gazette during the present trial in Parliament, there was one last week, which I do not exactly comprehend. Perhaps some military correspondent will favour me with a key. The article in question states the appointment of Lieut. Colonel Meyrick Shawe, *of the 5th Garrison Battalion*, to the Lieut. Colonelcy of the 76th Regiment, *lately returned from Spain*, vacant by the death of that excellent officer Col. Symes. It will be remembered, that Colonel Gordon in his evidence before the House, laid great stress on the regard which was always shewn for *strict regimental promotion* especially *in cases of service* Now what Lieut. Col. Shaw of the Garrison Battalion can have to do with the *76th Regiment just returned from Spain*, unless there is no officer in that

regiment to succeed Col. Symes, is a great mystery in these times. Has there been such havoc, that there is not a single officer surviving who is a fitter person to succeed, than Lieut.-Colonel Shawe? Is it a mistake of the copying clerk? Is it a mistake of the printer? Or what is it? If I feel some confusion of head in the present case, the reader will pardon me. These are times in which some men may reasonably put their hands to their heads to know whether they have got any at all.

☞

Mr. Maddison is elected President, and Mr. Clinton Vice-President of America, by great majorities.

Wednesday last, being the day appointed for a General Fast, Divine Service was performed in all the Churches; and at St. James's, a Sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Andrews, the Rector, from the 29th Chapter of Ezekiel, and 21st verse. *And they shall know that I am the Lord.* The worthy Rector, with the entrepid spirit of a Christian Minister, exhorted his Congregation to lead a moral and a religious life, and dwelt with peculiar emphasis on the crime of *Adultery*, which it plainly appeared was a growing enormity.—The church was crowded in every direction, and *his Royal Highness the Duke of* York, Earl Moira, and many of the Nobility were present, as also, the larger proportion of the St. James's Volunteers.

Mr. Finnerty's Counsel, on Friday, moved the Court to postpone his trial, on the ground that Major Hogan, (whose pamphlet Mr. Finnerty had published, and for which he is prosecuted by the Crown) would be a material evidence in the case, and that he was expected in England in March. Lord Ellenborough said the Court would comply with the motion if Mr. Finnerty would swear that he had reason to believe the Major would return. Mr. Finnerty's Counsel said he would ascertain that point.

THEATRICAL EXAMINER.

No. 42.

The new farce Is He a Prince?—It's amusing plot and national character.—German titles.—The new farce of the Unconscious Counterfeit.—It's amusing plot also.—Why called a comedy.

COVENT GARDEN COMPANY, HAYMARKET.

A new farce called *Is He a Prince*, said to be translated by a Mr. Greenlee, from the German, was produced at this theatre on Tuesday. It's plot fully explains it's general character. The young Prince of Anhalt, after succeeding his father, has just returned from his travels, and of course creates a great bustle among the courtiers, but particularly in the bosom of an old maid of quality (Mrs. Davenport), who sends to the Prince's portrait-painter for a likeness of her Sovereign in order to surprise him with the delicate compliment of wearing it on her introduction at court. The miniature arrives and is given to the care of the lady's niece (Miss Norton), who, while she is comparing the portrait with that of her secret lover, *Capt. Lindorff*, is surprised by her impatient aunt, to whom in her hurry and confusion she gives the Captain's likeness instead of the Prince's. The aunt, who has not seen the young Prince since he was a child, relies implicitly on the resemblance; and, in the mean time, *Capt. Lindorff* himself (Mr. Jones) arrives with a letter of introduction to the old lady's brother, a sporting Baron (Munden); the old lady perceives the likeness, it is whispered all over the family, every body concludes that it is the Prince, incog.; and the whole house with an officiousness not very obedient perhaps to the Sovereign's desire of concealment, but very natural to the awe-stricken souls of German courtiers, put on their best suits and most profound faces, and treat the Captain as his Serene Highness. The officer, though at first filled with an astonishment which only serves to confirm the family in the idea of his assumed character, is gradually initiated by his servant into the unavoidable, but seasonable nature of the joke; he acknowledges a passion for the young lady, who enters with much gravity into the spirit of the affair, and his proposals are of course received with ecstacy, to the great annoyance of an aukward fop (Mr. Liston), who at length, however, like a true courtier, upon a gracious reception from the Prince, turns with the breeze, and becomes a suiter for his new master. At this time, *Mr. Bluffberg* (Fawcett), the uncle of *Lindorff*, arrives on a visit to his old friend the Baron, but the Prince, much alarmed, pretends that he cannot see *this Mr. Bluffberg*, and warns the Baron how he receives a man entirely out of favour at Court. This petrifying advice produces a very amusing scene between the two friends; the Baron is every now and then inclined to burst out into his old hospitable warmth, but represses himself with a cold stiffness, utterly inexplicable to his visitor, who on learning with much astonishment the cause of his reception, insists on seeing the Prince, and at length rushes into his presence: the Prince turns his back upon him, the good old gentleman, who was always a favourite, is quite afflicted, he turns on all sides to get a glimpse of his sovereign's face, he does get a glimpse, the *Prince* rushes out, and *Mr. Bluffberg* after him with a stick, to the infinite horror of the spectators: presently they return, the Prince in great good humour and condescension, and the old gentleman in great favour; the latter makes some extraordinary requests to the utter amazement of the company:

Prince (with grave condescension).—We grant your requests.

Bluffberg—Probably your Serene Highness would have no objection to abdicate?

Prince (with great gravity.)—We abdicate.

Bluffberg.—Very likely your Highness would sink down at once to that factious young scoundrel, Captain Lindorff?.

Prince. Ah! ha! ha!

The secret is discovered: every body, but the old ambitious lady and the disappointed coxcomb become happy, and the piece concludes as it ought to do. I am afraid I have been sufficiently prolix in this story, but in pieces of mere plot, the incidents explain at once the nature of the humour and of the characters. Whatever there is of plot, or of the German in it, is certainly very well managed and entertaining: but whatever there is of English pleasantry in the dialogue is as poor as it need be in a Covent Garden farce. It is excellent in the story, that the incidents are not those which might reasonably happen in any other country, but are nationally characteristic. Nature, to be sure, is the same every where, but art is not, much less that national art of mode and manner, which depends so much on the political character of a nation. An audience learns something solid even from the plot of a farce, when it regards these distinctions, as in the present instance, which presents a very ludicrous but just sketch of that slavish attachment to petty forms and courts, that has had a secret but fatal effect on the politics of Germany.

A fondness for mere names and titles is always the mark of a declining state; and what could have been expected in a nation, where every district had its set of princes and courtiers, and every petty village its Mr. Sub-Collector of Taxes, and its Mr. Deputy Inspector of the Workhouse?—The piece was excellently performed throughout, though the characters, as they had no traits difficult of depictment, afforded no peculiar praise to the skill of the actors.

DRURY-LANE.

Another new farce, very like the former in it's first aspect, as it's title, the *Unconscious Counterfeit*, might suggest to the reader, was performed at this theatre on Thursday; though *for the honour of the country*, it is, I am told, no translation. A *Captain Dashfort* (Mr. Elliston) the nephew of a nobleman, flies from his London creditors into the mountains of Wales, where he is benighted with his lacquey; and in the midst of an harangue on the beauties of romantic excursion is set upon by thieves. The two travellers, after much bustle and beating, escape to a hospitable mansion-house, the owner of which (Dowton) has received a letter apprising him of the visit of a friend's nephew, who is to marry his daughter, (Miss Boyce) but means to come upon him incog. The old gentleman instantly determines that the benighted officer is the man, and accordingly facilitates the intercourse between his daughter and the stranger, who delighted with her appearance resolves to make use of his good fortune, though he has no idea of the father's mistake. The secret however is whispered about the house, and much pleasantry arises from the studied attention of the servants, and the inexplicable archness of the old gentleman, when his visitor calls himself a Captain of Dragoons and the nephew of a lord. In the mean time, the real incognito, *Belville* (Mr. Holland) who had already captivated the young lady's heart at a ball in the neighbourhood, arrives at the mansion, but finds the bloom of the business brushed away by the stranger; and being too bashful a man for awkward explanation, concludes with much patient agony, that his mistress's affections have been anticipated by his delay. His arrival is soon followed by that of his uncle *Chuckeebag*, who is an old usurer, and principal creditor of *Dashfort*, whom he has pursued with great ardour into Wales. He explains the cause of his journey to his old acquaintance, who immediately concludes that *Belville* is the object of his pursuit. The equivoque is then excellently carried on between all the parties. *Chucklebag* when he sees his nephew remonstrates with him for representing him as a lord; and the host in his interviews with *Dashfort* and *Belville* alarms and astonishes them both by saying that he has found out their secrets, while at the same time he invites the former to marry his daughter and tells the latter that he may walk out of the house. The whole matter is of course cleared up on a general meeting of the parties, and the piece ends with as good a bustle as it began. There is nothing new in the individual incidents of this story, but their combination is quick and surprising, its dialogue is well suited to the brisk familiarity of the circumstances, and it is altogether an entertaining and superior farce about the pitch of Mr. Allingham. It is but just indeed to both the new farces, to say that they have not indulged in the vile puns and praises of England, which are the refuge of our modern *comedy*-writers from humour and want of effect. But why the author of the *Unconscious Counterfeit* should call his entertaining compound of improbabilities a *Comedy*, is inconceivable, unless he means to argue, that if bad farces are called comedies, good ones have a better right to the title. To be sure, some monkies are more like their grinning, chattering, mimicking species than others; but the most respectable monkey that ever breathed, with the finest surname you can give him, is still a great remove from a man.

Elliston's *Dashfort*, while it equalled the liveliest style of Lewis in it's bustling vanity, in the quip, the crank, and the rib-tickling inuendo of finger, had the usual decided advantage over that excellent actor in dry humour. Penley with his brisk little person and his flushed lack-a-daisy face was a complete representative of the stupid giggling Welsh servant; and no man could desire a better footman than Decamp, who was very happy in expressing the sensibility of the bruises he received from the thieves, whenever his master happened to touch him. As to Miss Boyce, she is, as I said before, an amiable little statue, and does great credit to insipid young ladies.

☞

FINE ARTS.

BRITISH INSTITUTION.

To-morrow the Gallery will open to the public, and prove how propitious the Institution has been to the Arts from the excellent pictures it has produced from the Students. The Gallery also contains two from the accomplished hand of the President of the Royal Academy, and a few of its other Members, who are in general excelled by the Students and other untitled professors, especially Devis, in his *Death of Nelson*, which has been purchased by Alderman Boydell. His *Lady Macbeth* is excellent. Drummond has a capital painting of some Buildings and Figures in low life, but his other pieces are clumsy attempts at history. Beside his charming *Peasants of Subiaco*, Howard has a very poetic picture of *The first Navigator*. The Academicians Westall, Woodforde, Ward, Oliver, Shee, Northcote, Daniell, Reinagle, Bigg, and Clarke, have some good and some indifferent pictures. Turner has a capital Sea-piece. Copley has a poor copy of Mr. Davison's picture of *Lady Jane Grey*. Singleton's *Pangs of Adversity* is very praise-worthy, as is Joseph's *Flora dispensing her Sweets*. Mr. T. Barker's *Maniac* is highly pathetic. Laporte has some small, pleasing landscapes: those of the Messrs. Barker are admirable. The pieces of Arnald, Reynolds, Sass, Havell and R. R. Reinagle enrich the gallery. Miss H. Gouldsmith's are very spirited. Beside his admirable model of *Sampson*, Gahagan has a pleasing one of *Venus and Cupid*. Nollekens's *British Officer expiring in the arms of Victory*, and Goblet's *Bacchus*, are elegant models.—We shall continue our remarks on the pictures individually during the Exhibition.

The print of the *Little Mountaineer* from a painting of Devis, and that of *Lady Heathcote* in a fancy attitude, from Cosway, have recently conferred a respectability on the windows of some of our print shops, debased and disfigured as they have long been by the coloured outlines of affected little brats and loose girls in shifts, born and bred in the prurient fancy of Buck. For simplicity and nature, the Little Mountaineer vies with Owen's charming little pictorial progeny. Its attitude in playing with a kid, is in-

fahtine grace and vivacity. The various parts are engraved by Scriven in the mixed style, with their characteristic surfaces. Shaggy lines, intermixed with dots, enrich the landscape. A dotted line displays the direction of the drapery folds, and delicate gradations in entire dot, pourtray the healthy plumpness of the girl's flesh. Mr. Agar's print of *Lady Heathcote* ranks immediately next to Mr. Cardon's tasteful sculptures from the elegant drawings of Cosway.

R. H.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir—Mr. Scriven thinks that your former Correspondent treated his mis-named defence of Chalk Engraving with too much levity. I think he treated its author with too much indulgence. He did but play with foils, when he might have spoken daggers.

I am sorry to see, Mr. Editor, that their are bigots in Dotting as there formerly were in Religion, who are insensible of the value of indulgencies, unless they are made to pay for them. Mr. Scriven has been used to transactions with the honest shopmen of Cheapside, and will probably expect a bargain in sinning; I promise him in this case, that he shall not pay too dear, and by no means to the full amount—I was about to say, of his folly: but I hope to get through this letter without calling him either fool, knave, or coward. In short, I will hurt him as little as possible, while I disarm him.

To defend Mr. Landseer from *such* attacks as those of Mr. Scriven, cannot be necessary. If Jesus Christ was crucified and Socrates poisoned on account of the truths they promulgated, it must be expected, as matter of course, by every other person who aims at exposing public abuses, or reforming the public taste, that ignorance and selfishness will do what they can to thwart him. It is a species of honourable testimony; as you have yourself experienced, Mr. Editor, in the silly resentments of the Scrivens of the Stage.

In his second epistle, Mr. Scriven seems ambitious of emulating the accomplished Mr. Hague. He throws off the mask he had assumed, of defending Chalk Engraving; but does it with an air of vexation and indecency which would excite both contempt and disgust, if these sentiments were not absorbed in the regret that any man who has been allowed to call himself an Artist, should possess so little of the manners or feelings of a Gentleman.

I shall certainly not imitate him either in the coarse style of his personalities, or in his affectation of piety and brotherly love. He has left abundant room for plain truth to steer clear of both. Having pledged my intention to call him neither fool, knave, nor coward, I shall only desire you to observe how far such conduct as Mr. Scriven has pursued on this occasion of his own creating, *proves* him to *deserve* any of those epithets.

Though the tenour of your "Constant Reader's" remarks on Mr. Scriven's first letter be indulgent, it contains a single sentence which might have been thought severe, if Mr. Scriven had not in his second letter fully demonstrated his claims to the justness of its application, and deepened our regret that "*egregious inadvertency or gross falsehood*" should have invaded a mind so temperate, so wise, so disinterested, so polished, and so elegantly noble, as that of Mr. Scriven. I mean to apply this sentence to the passages on which that accurate and profound writer appears to have principally relied, in his attempts to enlighten or deceive his readers.

In the first place, Mr. Scriven's second letter delicately discloses a certain virtuous and amiable habit, which he might think too openly displayed in his first, of misquoting his opponent, and betrays a most exquisite discernment in confounding metaphor with matter of fact. In the letter of your Constant Reader, I see no reflection whatever upon Mr. Scriven's physical short-sightedness, of which it is truly distressing to read. The sense of that letter is plainly this—To see through the dust of *such* a combat as takes place when a man's prejudices and his interests and perhaps his passions, are at strife with his reason, requires better spectacles than those of Mr. Scriver. Reading this sentence, Mr. Scriven (who it should seem really does wear spectacles) would make it appear the defects of his mental perception are alluded to in one part, and certain glass assistants to his visual organs in the other; and accordingly he writes a sublime, short-sighted apostrophe, which must doubtless have called forth your—sympathy.

As to "feeding on a Review" and "staining the pages of truth"—such things are certainly not uncommon: but as correct readers will find no such expressions in the letter of your Constant Reader, he can claim no credit for their wit. In short, these, like the insidious passages of Mr. Scriven's former letter, are mere mis-quotations on his part, and as I stand engaged to hurt him as little as possible, we will set them down, if you please, along with the spectacles, to the account of egregious inadvertency.

In the next place, when you were requested to invite Mr. S. (whom I understand you acknowledge as an old friend, or acquaintance at least) to meet your Correspondent who signs himself a Constant Reader (and is an old friend of mine) either at your house or any other, I know that the motive which dictated that request were a hope of convincing Mr. Scriven of the unwise controversy which he had incautiously begun, and a wish to persuade him of the error of imagining that such controversies could be at all interesting to the public: in short, I knew that he would have been treated only as a mistaken man. But since he has declined an amicable interview, and prefers to exhibit for the second time his literary gladiatorship—he must take the consequences. I have not done with him: but at present will not trespass further on your patience than to assist Mr. Scriven in giving something like a pertinent application to his facetious anecdote of the late Mr. Barry.

I have known many men of truth and talent who have knocked at the door of that distinguished artist (and I have sometimes knocked there myself), but never heard of such an answer being given *to any of them* as Mr. Scriven relates. Yet still, Mr. Editor, let us preserve our charity. Let us still suppose that only egregious inadvertency guides a goose quill over foolscap. Mr. Scriven doubtless here speaks *from experience*, and the evidence of his unerring senses, and who shall contradict or distrust him? I am, Sir, *your* humble servant, but to Mr. Scriven, I am

Not at Home.

(The Postscript to this Letter in our next.)

NEW SHERIFFS.

The following is a List of the Sheriffs for England and Wales, for the year ensuing, as pricked by his Majesty, in Council:—

Bedfordshire—Robert Garstin, of Harrold, Esq.
Berkshire—Sir Thomas Theophilus Metcalfe, of Fernhill, Bt.
Bucks—Thomas Stanhope Badcock, of Buckingham, Esq.
Cambridgeshire—John Heathcote, of Conington Castle, Esq.
Cheshire—Thomas William Tatton, of Wittinshaw, Esq.
Cumberland—Miles Ponsonby, of Hail-Hall, Esq.
Derbyshire—Charles Upton, of Derby, Esq.
Devonshire—Sir Thomas Dyke Acklaud, of Kelterton, Bart.
Dorsetshire—James John Farquharson, of Langton, Esq.
Essex—John Rutherford Abdy, of Albyns, Esq.
Gloucestershire—J. H. Moggridge, of Dymock Park, Esq.
Herefordshire—William Wall, of Leominster, Esq.
Hertfordshire—Edmond Darby, of Ashton-house, Esq.
Kent—Sir Brooke William Bridges, of Goodneston, Bart.
Lancaster—Samuel Clowes, Esq. of Broughton Hall.
Leicestershire—Sir W. Manners, of Beckminster, Bart.
Lincolnshire—Sir Robert Heron, of Stubton, Bart.
Monmouthshire—J. K. G. Kemys, of Pertholey, Esq.
Norfolk—James Coldham, of Anmer, Esq.
Northamptonshire—Robert Andrew, of Harleston, Esq.
Northumberland—W. S. Brewere, of Bewicke, Esq.
Nottinghamshire—Thomas Walker, of Bury-hill, Esq.
Oxfordshire—John Harrison, of Shelswell, Esq.

Rutlandshire—A. W. Bellacre, of Bulmerthorpe, Esq.
Shropshire—William Sparling, of Petton, Esq.
Somersetshire—John Norton, of Milverton, Esq.
Staffordshire—Theophilus Levett, of Whichner, Esq.
County of Southampton—John Blackburn, of Preston Candover, Esq.
Suffolk—John Dresser, of Blyford, Esq.
Surrey—Edwark Bilke, of Southwark, Esq.
Sussex—Thomas Tourle, of Landport, Esq.
Warwickshire—A. Bracebridge, of Atherstone, Esq.
Wiltshire—Sir C. W. Mallett, of Wilbury-house, Bart.
Worcestershire—Postponed.
Yorkshire—Sir George Wombwell, of Wombwell, Bart.

SOUTH WALES.

Camarthenshire—R. I. Starke, of Langharne Castle, Esq.
Pembroke—Charles Allen Phillips, of the Hill, Esq.
Cardigan—William Skyrme, of Altgock, Esq.
Glamorgan—Jeremiah Homfray, of Llandaff, Esq.
Brecon—Thomas Wood, of Gwernivett, Esq.
Radnor—John Whittaker, of Cascob, Esq.

NORTH WALES.

Merioneth—William Davies, of Ty Ucha, Esq.
Carnarvonshire—T. P. J. Parry, of Madryn, Esq.
Anglesey—Sir J. T. Stanley, of Bodewryd, Bart.
Montgomeryshire—Robert Knight, of Gwernygoe, Esq.
Denbighshire—Joseph Ablet, of Llanbedo, Esq.
Flintshire—Thomas Peate, of Bistree, Esq.

BY THE PRINCE OF WALES.

Cornwall—The Honorable Charles Bagnal Agar.

LAW.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

THE KING v. ALEX. DAVISON, ESQ.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH stated to the Counsel for the defendant, that from the hurry of the business in this term, it was likely that the Court could not pass sentence during this term. He said, however, that it would occasion no inconvenience, as the imprisonment during the interval would go to constitute a part of the sentence, a portion of that species of punishment which the Court would most probably inflict. It had been thrown out that the Defendant had made compensation, in as much as he had relinquished the profits of the contract. He wished to know whether those profits could be reduced to any accurate estimate?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that he had urged that Mr. Davison ought not to retain any portion of the money which had been paid him by the public for services which he had not performed. How much that amount was had not been ascertained. Even civilly, that ought to be returned before the Court could enter into any consideration of the arguments which had been urged as an appeal for mercy.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH then said, that between this and the next term, the defendant would have an opportunity of making that atonement at the least.

ACCIDENTS, OFFENCES, &c.

On Monday morning an inquest was held on the body of Mr. George Johnson. The deceased was about 40 years of age, and had most respectable connections in town; he had been first Lieutenant of the *Alkmaar*, 50, and was afterwards first lieutenant of the *Eyderen* sloop. On Friday semnight he dined with Mr. Willats, of Brewer-street, Golden-square, and after taking leave of some other friends, set out to join his ship at the Great Nore; but finding the night far advanced, he applied for lodging at different places in Kent-street and the Kent-road, but to no effect. There was nothing further heard about him until Saturday morning, when his body was found barbarously murdered on the Kent-road.—Thomas Hamilton, of Kent-street, labourer, was going from his house to Hartford to work, on Saturday morning; at half after three, as he walked along the road, near Five Bells-row, the moon shone very bright, and he saw something lying on the ground close to Captain Hardcastle's gate; he went up towards it, and discovered the body; a man directly jumped over the railing, and said to the witness, "What do you want there? If you don't go about your business, I'll serve you the same." The witness being very much alarmed, bid the man good morning, and walked on. Mr. Blanchard, of Peckham, Surgeon, described the various wounds that had been inflicted on the deceased; he had received about ten wounds on the face, six on the left hand, by one of which the thumb was nearly severed from the rest of the hand, as if the deceased had, in the course of a vigorous resistance, grasped at some sharp instrument, which was dragged through his hand; there were several punctures or incisions, by a pointed instrument, in the neck and neckcloth; one in particular of a triangular shape; there were two desperate wounds on the back of the head, by which the pericranium was broken, and one wound in a diagonal direction on the neck, by which the great carotid artery was separated, as if by a blunt-edged instrument; either of the three last mentioned wounds would have been sufficient to have occasioned death. Mr. Dyke, the landlord of the house where the inquest was held, John Clybourn, an ostler, and others, proved the finding of the body. Verdict —*Wilful Murder, by some person or persons unknown.*

A gentleman of the name of Wary, who occupied apartments at the house of Mrs. Molloy, in Oxford-street, was let into his apartment at two o'clock on Wednesday morning. In ten minutes after Mr. W. had retired to his bed-room, she was alarmed by the report of a pistol, and on bursting open the door of the lodger, he was found to have blown his head to atoms. He has only been three weeks in London from the Indies, and was supposed to have met with disappointments in play; he was about 30, of a respectable family in Rutland.

A fine female child, to all appearance three months old, was found carefully wrapped up in a basket, and tied to the knocker of Mr. Faulkner's house, in Mary-le-bonne New-road, on Tuesday night at ten o'clock. The infant was discovered by one of the servants, and from its dress, was supposed to belong to a person far from needy in circumstances. The unnatural parent remains undiscovered.

The following barbarous murder recently occurred in the vicinity of Ballibay, Ireland. The children of two neighbouring farmers having quarrelled, the father of the beaten party chastized the other so severely, that he was threatened with legal prosecution by the parents. The affair was, however, compromised, upon the aggressor promising to pay 10*l*. With a view to fulfil this engagement, his wife, the following day, carried the produce of their little industry to market, when, in her absence, the husband, under some diabolical impulse, murdered two of his children in a way too terrible to relate. It appears to have been his desperate intention to butcher the remaining three of his children; but the cries of the two sufferers alarmed the rest, and they fled. It is impossible to assign any motive for this rash and unnatural deed, but the irritation and chagrin arising from the preceding circumstances. The unfortunate perpetrator has, we understand, delivered himself into the hands of justice, and is at present in Monaghan goal.

MARRIAGES.

On Saturday week at Lambeth Church, Mr. Keating, of the Strand, to Miss Brooks, daughter of the late Wm. Brooks, Esq. of Hern Hill, Surrey.

DEATHS.

Last week, at his seat, Northwood-place, Suffolk, aged 75, the Rev. Dr. Temple, Rector of Lindley, in the same county.

On Sunday se'nnight, at Doncaster, aged 66, Mr. Charles Spencer, late of York, and formerly of the Sheffield Theatre.

On Wednesday, the Duke of Ancaster: this Dukedom is therefore extinct; but the Earldom of Lindsay falls to General Bertie.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER Office, 15, Beaufort Buildings, Strand.—Price 8½*d*.